REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action dated on August 14, 2007.

Claims 1, 7, 11, 13, 17, 21, 25, 28, 33, and 40 are amended; as a result, claims 1-46 are now pending in this application.

Example support for the amendments may be found in a variety of locations throughout the original filed specification. By way of example only, the Examiner's attention is directed to the original filed specification page 11 last full paragraph, page 12 first full paragraph, *etc.*

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 13-18, 21, 23 and 25-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by De La Iglesia et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,490,703). It is of course fundamental that in order to sustain an anticipation rejection that each and every limitation in the rejected claims must be taught or suggested in the exact detail and identical arrangement in the cited reference.

Here de la Iglesia stores the data to memory in an inverted format if there is an indication to do so. In other words, the user reboots the system and a process takes place to inspect the contents of memory and if an inversion is appropriate the data is stored in its inverted format. The data does not remain unchanged in any device at all in de la Iglesia where it remains unchanged if inversion is required. The Applicant believes this point actually highlights some of the other points Applicant has been attempting to make with respect to multiple devices and multiple communications taking place in Applicant's invention; which Applicant believes is lacking in the de la Iglesia reference.

To illustrate this point the Examiner is invited to review FIG. 8 of de la Iglesia where the word is just stored in an inverted state in memory and after a reboot. In particular, see reference numerals 808 and 818.

Accordingly, Applicant believes that the de la Iglesia reference lacks each and every limitation of the rejected claims and that the rejections of record should be withdrawn. Applicant respectfully requests an indication of the same.

Claims 1-37, 39-41 and 44-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Norman (U.S. Patent No. 5,873,112).

Norman does not teach the newly cited limitations as described above with reference to de la Iglesia. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of record with respect to Norman be withdrawn as well.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 38, 42 and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Norman (U.S. Patent No. 5,873,112) in view of Goldstein (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0028672). These claims are dependent from amended independent claims; therefore, for the amendments and remarks presented above with respect to the independent claims these rejections should be withdrawn. Applicant respectfully requests an indication of the same.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (513) 942-0224 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Reservation of Rights

In the interest of clarity and brevity, Applicant may not have addressed every assertion made in the Office Action. Applicant's silence regarding any such assertion does not constitute any admission or acquiescence. Applicant reserves all rights not exercised in connection with this response, such as the right to challenge or rebut any tacit or explicit characterization of any reference or of any of the present claims, the right to challenge or rebut any asserted factual or legal basis of any of the rejections, the right to swear behind any cited reference such as provided under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 or otherwise, or the right to assert co-ownership of any cited reference. Applicant does not admit that any of the cited references or any other references of record is relevant to the present claims, or that they constitute prior art. To the extent that any rejection or assertion is based upon the Examiner's personal knowledge, rather than any objective evidence of record as manifested by a cited prior art reference, Applicant timely objects to such reliance on Official Notice, and reserves all rights to request that the Examiner provide a reference or affidavit in support of such assertion, as required by MPEP § 2144.03. Applicant reserves all rights to pursue any cancelled claims in a subsequent patent application claiming the benefit of priority of the present patent application, and to request rejoinder of any withdrawn claim, as required by MPEP § 821.04.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(513) 942-0224

Date _____10/15/07_____ By _____

Joseph P. Mehrle
Reg. No. 45,535

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this _15_ day of October 2007.

Name

Signature